

L. C. Todd

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. I.

SALEM, O., FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1845.

NO. 35.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

Published every Friday at

SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., O.

JAMES BARNABY, Jr., General Agent.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, }
J. ELIZABETH JONES, } Editors.

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.

Terms:—\$1.50 per annum, or \$2.00 if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing. Advertisements making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents—one square \$1.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE:—Sam'l Brooke, George Garretson, James Burnaby, Jr., David L. Gallisth, Let Holmes.

J. H. PAINTER, PRINTER.

LETTER FROM FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

REPLY TO MR. C. C. THOMPSON.

To the Editor of the Liberator:

DEAR FRIEND:—For the sake of our righteous cause, I was delighted to see by an extract copied into the Liberator of 12th Dec., 1844, from the Delaware Republican, that Mr. A. C. C. Thompson, No. 101, Market street, Wilmington, has undertaken to invalidate my testimony against the slaveholders, whose names I have made prominent in the narrative of my experience while in slavery. Slaveholders and slave-traders never botay greater indiscretion, than when they venture to defend themselves, or their system of plunder, in any other community than a slaveholding one. Slavery has its own standard of morality, humanity, justice, and Christianity. Tried by that standard, it is a system of the great kindness to the slave—sanctioned by the purest morality—in perfect agreement with justice—and, of course, not inconsistent with Christianity. But, tried by any other, it is doomed to condemnation. The naked relation of master and slave is one of those monstrous darkness, to whom the light of truth is death! The wise ones among the slaveholders know this, and they studiously avoid doing anything, which, in their judgment, tends to elicit truth. They seem fully to understand, that their safety is in their silence. They may have learned this wisdom from Junius, who counselled his opponent, Sir William Draper, when defending Lord Granby, never to attract attention to a character, which would only pass without condemnation, when it passed without observation.

I am now almost too far away to answer this attempted refutation by Mr. Thompson. I fear his article will be forgotten, before you get my reply. I, however, think the whole thing worth reviving, as it is seldom we have so good a case for discussion. In any country but the United States, I might hope to get a hearing through the paper in which I was attacked. But this would be inconsistent with American usage and magnanimity. It would be folly to expect such a hearing. They might possibly advertise me as a runaway slave, and share the reward of my apprehension; but on no other condition would they allow my reply a place in their columns. In this, however, I may judge the "Republican" harshly. It may be that, having admitted Mr. Thompson's article, the editor will think it but fair—negro though I am—to allow my reply an insertion.

In replying to Mr. Thompson, I shall proceed as I usually do in preaching the slaveholder's sermon—dividing the subject under two general heads, as follows:—

1st. The statement of Mr. Thompson, in confirmation of the truth of my narrative.

2ndly. His denials of its truthfulness.

Under the first, I beg Mr. Thompson to accept my thanks for his full, free and unsolicited testimony, in regard to my identity. There now need be no doubt on that point, however much there might have been before. Your testimony, Mr. Thompson, has settled the question forever. I give you the fullest credit for the deed, saying nothing of the motive. But for you, sir, the pro-slavery people in the North might have persisted, with some show of reason, in representing me as being an impostor—a free negro who had never been south of Mason & Dixon's line—one whom the abolitionists, acting on the jesuitical principle, that the end justifies the means, had educated and sent forth to attract attention to their faltering cause. I am greatly indebted to you, sir, for silencing those truly prejudicial insinuations. I wish I could make you understand the amount of service you have done. You have completely tripped up the heels of your pro-slavery friends, and laid them flat at my feet. You have done a piece of anti-slavery work, which no anti-slavery man could do. Our cautious and truth-loving people of New England would never have believed this testimony, in proof of my identity, had it been borne by an abolitionist. Not that they really think an abolitionist capable of bearing false witness intentionally; but such persons are thought fanatical, and to look at everything through a distorted medium. They will believe you—they will believe a slaveholder. They have, some how or other, imbibed (and I confess strangely enough) the idea that persons such as yourself are dispassionate, im-

partial and disinterested, and therefore capable of giving a fair representation of things connected with slavery. Now, under these circumstances, your testimony is of the utmost importance. It will serve to give effect to my exposures of slavery, both at home and abroad. I hope I shall not administer to your vanity when I tell you that you seem to have been raised up for this purpose! I came to this land with the highest testimonials from some of the most intelligent and distinguished abolitionists in the United States; yet some here have entertained and expressed doubt as to whether I have ever been a slave. You may easily imagine the perplexing and embarrassing nature of my situation, and how anxious I must have been to be relieved from it. You, sir, have relieved me. I now stand before both the American and British public, endorsed by you as being just what I have ever represented myself to be—to wit, an American slave.

You say, "I knew this recant slave by the name of Frederick Bailey" (instead of Douglass.) Yes, that was my name; and leaving out the term recant, which savors a little of bitterness, your testimony is direct and perfect—just what I have long wanted. But you are not yet satisfied. You seem determined to bear the most ample testimony in my favor. You say you know me when I lived with Mr. Covey. "And with most of the persons" mentioned in my narrative, "you are intimately acquainted." This is excellent. Then Mr. Edward Covey is not a creature of my imagination, but really did and may yet exist.

You thus brush away the miserable insinuation of my northern pro-slavery enemies, that I have used fictitious not real names. You say—"Col. Lloyd was a wealthy planter. Mr. Gore was once an overseer for Col. Lloyd, but is now living near St. Michael's, is respected, and (you) believe he is a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Mr. Thomas Auld is an honorable and worthy member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and all that can be said of him is, that he is a good Christian." &c., &c. Do allow me, once more, to thank you for this triumphant vindication of the truth of my statements; and to show you how highly I value your testimony. I will inform you that I am now publishing a second edition of my narrative in this country, having already disposed of the first. I will insert your article with my reply as an appendix, to the edition now in progress. If you find any fault with my frequent thanks, you may find some excuse for me in the fact, that I have serious fears that you will be but poorly thanked by those whose characters you have felt it your duty to defend. I am almost certain they will regard you as running before you were sent, and as having spoken when you should have been silent. Under these trying circumstances, it is evidently the duty of those interested in your welfare to extend to you such words of consolation as may ease, if not remove, the pain of your sad disappointment! But enough of this.

Now, then, to the second part—or your denials. You are confident I did not write the book; and the reason of your confidence is, that when you knew me, I was an unlearned and rather an ordinary negro. Well, I have to admit I was rather an ordinary negro when you knew me, and I do not claim to be a very extraordinary one now. But you knew me under very unfavorable circumstances. It was when I lived with Mr. Covey, the negro-breaker, and member of the Methodist Church. I had just been living with Master Thomas Auld, where I had been reduced by hunger. Master Thomas did not allow me enough to eat. Well, when I lived with Mr. Covey, I was driven so hard, and whipped so often, that my soul was crushed and my spirits broken. I was a mere wreck. The degradation to which I was then subjected, as I now look back to it, seems more like a dream than a horrible reality. I can scarcely realize how I ever passed through it, without quite losing all my moral and intellectual energies. I can easily understand that you sincerely doubt if I wrote the narrative; for if any one had told me, seven years ago, I should ever be able to write such an one, I should have doubted as strongly as you now do. You must not judge me now by what I then was—a change of circumstances has made a surprising change in me. Frederick Douglass, the free man, is a very different person from Frederick Bailey, the slave. I feel myself almost a new man—freedom has given me new life. I fancy you would scarcely know me. I think I have altered very much in my general appearance, and know I have in my manners. You remember when I used to meet you on the road to St. Michael's, or near Mr. Covey's lane gate, I hardly dared to lift my head, and look up at you. If I should meet you now, amid the free hills of old Scotland, where the ancient "black Douglass" once met his foes, I presume I might summon sufficient fortitude to look you full in the face; and were you to attempt to make a slave of me, it is possible you might find me almost as disagreeable a subject, as was the Douglass to whom I have just referred. Of one thing, I am certain—you would see a great change in me!

I trust I have now explained away your reason for thinking I did not write the narrative in question. You next deny the existence of such cruelty in Maryland as I reveal in my narrative; and ask, with true marvellous simplicity, "could it be possible that charitable, feeling men could murder human beings with as little remorse as the narrative of this infamous libeller would make us believe; and that the laws of Maryland, which operate alike upon black and white, bond and free, could permit such foul murders to pass unnoticed?" "No," you say "it is impossible." I am not to determine a charitable, feeling man can do; but, to show what Maryland slaveholders actually do, their charitable feeling is to be determined by their deeds, and not their words by their charitable feelings. The cow-skin makes as deep a gash in my flesh, when wielded by a professed saint, as it does when wielded by an open sinner. The deadly musket does as fatal execution when its trigger is pulled by Austin Gore, the Christian, as when the same is done by Beal Bondy, the infidel. The best way to ascertain what those charitable, feeling men can do, will be to point you to the laws made by them, and which you say operate alike upon the white and the black, the bond and the free. By consulting the statute laws of Maryland, you will find the following:—"Any slave for running in the night, or riding horses in the day time without leave, or running away, may be punished by whipping, cropping, branding in the cheek, or otherwise—not rendering him unfit for labor."—p. 337.—"Any slave convicted of petty treason, murder, or wilful burning of dwelling-houses, may be sentenced to have the right hand cut off, to be hanged in the usual way—his head severed from his body—the body divided into four quarters, and the head and quarters set up in the most public place where such act was committed."—p. 190.—"Now, Mr. Thompson, when you consider with what ease a slave may be convicted of any one or all of these crimes, how bloody and atrocious do those laws appear! Yet, sir, they are but the breath of those pious and charitable, feeling men whom you would defend. I am sure I have recorded in my narrative, nothing so revoltingly cruel, murderous, infernal, as may be found in your own statute book.

You say that the laws of Maryland operate alike upon the white and black, the bond and free. If you mean by this, that the parties named are all equally protected by law, you perpetrate a falsehood as big as that told by President Polk in his inaugural address. It is a notorious fact, even on this side of the Atlantic, that a black man cannot testify against a white man in any Court in Maryland, or any other slave State. If you do not know this, you are more than ordinarily ignorant, and are to be pitied rather than censured. I will not say "that the detection of this falsehood proves all you have said to be false" for I wish to avail myself of your testimony, in regard to my identity, but I will say, you have made yourself very liable to suspicion.

I will close these remarks by saying your positive opposition to slavery is fully explained, and will be well understood by anti-slavery men, when you say the evil of the system does not fall upon the slave but the slaveholder. This is like saying that the evil of being burnt is not felt by the person burnt, but by him who kindles up the fire about him.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

Perth, (Scotland,) 27th Jan. 1846.

THE UNIVERSALISTS.

The following Protest is the one adopted by the general convention of Universalists in September last, and which was directed to be circulated among the clergy of that denomination for signatures.

PROTEST.

It is not from an idle curiosity, but from a deep interest in the signs and promises of better days, that we desire to know how stands the ministry of the Universalist church, in reference to the great question of American Slavery. The measure hereby adopted, is one that promises such a result, as the request is preferred to every minister of the Universalist denomination in the United States, with brotherly affection and true respect. We wish, moreover, to know from whom we can expect hearty fellowship and co-operation in our prayers, our pleas, and our labors, to advance the cause of Human Freedom, and to whom we can look for sympathy in our abhorrence and detestation of that system which destroys, as far as man has power to destroy the grand distinction between mankind and brutes, and which holds in perpetual bondage three and a half millions of our fellow creatures. We believe that by presenting a united front, we can add something to the moral power that is creating a deep horror at the monstrous wrong of Slavery; and that shall gather strength and greatness till human nature cannot withstand the majesty of the demand to "let the oppressed go free," but shall glorify God by loyalty to Right and Duty. With this desire, hope and trust, we offer our Protest against American Slavery, in the following reasons:

1. Because it denies the eternal distinction between a man and property, ranking a human being with a material thing. The attributes of the soul forbid such a classification; for that alone can be recognized as property which is not wrunged by the act of being owned by another. To man was originally given dominion over the lower order of animals that he might hold them as property, but he has no right nor grant to own his fellow-being.

2. Because Slavery does not award to the laborer the fruits of his toil, in any higher sense than to cattle. All the claim to any property—even to the fruits of the tillage of

the smallest plot of ground—depends on the will of him who claims it by the same tenure, both the soil and the laborer. Man was created to own, and not to be owned; the claim of another upon the fruits of his toil as upon the product of the service of a mere animal, overlooks the higher nature and the absolute rights of a human being.

3. Because Slavery trammels the intellectual powers and prevents their expansion. The expansibility of the human mind is one of its chief glories, and endless means are appropriated to it by its Creator. To labor systematically to dwarf the intellect, is to prevent the opening to a full vision, of the eye that God made, wherewith man should see him in the manifestations of himself through his laws. This Slavery does. It denies to the slave even the alphabet of knowledge, the simplest elements of intellectual progress. The very enactment of laws which forbid, under heavy penalties, any one to teach the slave to read and write, implies all that we claim for his intellectual capacity, and manifestly declares that the maintenance of the system depends upon dwarfing the intellect.

4. Because Slavery checks the development of the moral nature of the slave. It denies him rights, and thereby denies him responsibility. With the denial of his manhood, necessarily goes his accountability; for where the distinction between persons and things is lost, the duties and responsibilities of the person are merged and lost in the thing. The slave is, to all the intents and purposes, a property, a dep level of his moral nature, and thereby of his participation in a common humanity.

5. Because Slavery involves a practical denial of the religious nature of the slave. The supreme will, to the slave, is the will of the master; and that which dwarfs the intellect, and checks the development of the moral nature, must be opposed to religious growth. It takes from the victim the means which God has furnished to beget and foster a true and filial reverence towards Himself, and gives him no religion but credulity. It shuts up the Bible from the slave as effectually as ever Popery did from the people in the dark days of its terrific power.

6. Because Slavery presents an insurmountable barrier to the propagation of the great truth of the Universal Brotherhood, and thereby most effectually prevents the progress of true Christianity. Under its broad shadow, Universalism cannot grow. The seed is at best, sown among thorns that check its germination. Under the legitimate influence of such a system, the soul cannot regard with favor the religion which has the same voice and tone, the same commands and warnings, the same hopes and promises, for him who is regarded as a thing and classed with cattle, as for the most elevated and gifted of the human race. And inasmuch as Slavery denies the inequality that exists, by the attributes of human nature, between man and man, it cannot but frown on the religion of Christ, which is based on that equality, and whose great and fundamental principle of morality is to do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you.

7. Because the essential nature of Slavery cannot be altered by any kindness, how great soever, practiced towards the slave. Kindness is but flowers in the links of the chain whose iron ends into the soul, and no sweetness can lull the moral sense into forgetfulness of what slavery is. The highest kindness is comparatively nothing, while the manhood of the slave is denied or forgotten; for the first demand of love is, to respect the rights of another. While many slaveholders in y, according to their conception of things, practice the utmost kindness to their slaves, that cannot alter one feature of deformity in the system of Slavery.

8. Because the long continuance of a system of wrong cannot palliate it, but on the other hand augments the demand for its abolition. New victims are ushered into existence every day, while the natural affections and the sanctities of marriage and domestic life are disregarded and made subordinate to the interests of property.

9. Because while we would in all charity remember that peculiarities of situation may affect the judgment and moral sense, still we must not forget, that no peculiarity of situation can excuse a perpetual denial of universal principles and obligations. Freedom is not the gift of charters and communities; it is not a benefit bestowed by geographical localities, but it is inherent in man as man, by the attributes of his nature. Our religion demands of us, with a voice that cannot be silenced, that no limit of territory shall be permitted to exclude man from our sympathy, and no conventional laws shall supersede the eternal requisitions of justice and mercy.

American Slavery is a system of wrongs, from its first principle to its crowning assumption; and in its train of evils are found all the liabilities that have eaten out the life of communities and nations. It legalizes sins that are abhorrent to the simplest moral sense; and in the increasing intelligence and philanthropy of the present age, it becomes more and more a stigma on the National Name, a curse to our country's prosperity, and a giant moral evil that must be overthrown, or it will overthrow us by the retributive justice of Him who has declared the truth—"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

For these reasons we protest against this system of American Slavery as utterly wrong, and confess our obligation to use all justifiable means to promote its Abolition.

If a man is happy and contented in slavery, he knows not the feelings of a man.

From the Independent Democrat.
GOVERNOR MORTON AND SOUTHERN SENATORS.

If ever there was a time when every man of the North was called upon to rouse himself, and speak out on the great question of Slavery, and the rapid augmentation of the slave power in the Union, now is the moment. To the shame of every son of this pilgrim, be it spoken, to the eternal infamy of the base pimps of corruption who have prostrated themselves and the Government beneath the iron car of Slavery there are men now at Washington, plotting with might and main, to procure the rejection of Democrats from office by Southern Senators, on the sole ground of their former opposition to Slavery. There are scores of men, from New England, nay, from New Hampshire, the whole burden of whose song against certain appointments of the President, is their former abolition sentiments.

Now, so far as the offices are concerned, we care not whether they are filled by this man or that. We care as little for the man as the vote. Unprincipled partisanship rather than honest integrity, have, as usual, formed the chief recommendations. But we do think it time for every friend of liberty and independence to pause and tremble for his country, when, as now, it is openly proclaimed at the seat of Government, that no man can hold office, with the advice of the Senate, who has ever, even among the mountain fastnesses of New Hampshire, dared to breathe forth the deep throbbings of a soul all unspiced by the mildew of human servitude.

We think it time for every freeman of New Hampshire whose spirit is still uncurbed by the iron bit of Slavery, to tell the South in a voice worthy of our fathers, that when the slave power attempts to chain the free speech of the North, it is treading on forbidden ground.

A great effort has been, and still is making, to procure the rejection of Governor Morton, Collector at Boston, for the crime of having, while Governor of Massachusetts, signed resolutions of the Legislature against the Annexation of Texas. For this, one would think he might have atoned by his subsequent servility to the South. But seems Southern Senators do not so easily forgive the crime of opposition to the "peculiar institution." The mark of Cain is upon him, and no after repentance can efface the brand. With Governor Morton's present position as a man, we have not much sympathy. Nor can we respect the extraordinary success, with which he attempts to sustain himself, by denying his former opposition to Slavery. That citizen of New England, who will either apologize for, or plead not guilty to such a charge, is a disgrace to his age and to the memory of his fathers. We have no respect for any Northern man, who, for the paltry consideration of an office, will bend and crouch before a power as fearfully hostile to the liberties of our country, as to the happiness of our race.

Had Governor Morton replied to the charges of abolition and opposition to Texas, as a Northern man should; had he, instead of denying and attempting to disprove the charge, boldly and fearlessly thrown himself upon the North; had he stood up like a man, and said to the South and to Southern Senators, "I am a Northern man, and a free man.—What I have written or spoken against Slavery, I wrote and said as a Northern and a free man. In what I said, I but spoke the universal sentiment of the North. By that I am willing to stand or fall. You may, gentlemen, strike me down; but let me tell you, that the whole people of the North will also feel the blow—aye, and avenge it too."

Had he thus spoken, and thus acted, how infinitely would Governor Morton now stand above his present pitiable position! With what enthusiasm might he have rallied the united Democracy of New England to his rescue! How proudly tower above his enemies, defying alike the slave power at the South, and its tools at the North! As it is, he may fall a sacrifice to his former character as a freeman; but his latter servility will permit no friend of liberty to avenge his death, or weep at his grave.

SLAVERY IN MARYLAND.—The slaveholders in Queen Anne's county, Md., recently held a meeting and passed a lot of resolutions including these:

Resolved, That the Legislature of this State be requested, to pass a law prohibiting free negroes in this State, under heavy penalties, from leaving the State and returning again, except as servants to a white citizen.

Resolved, That in like manner they be requested to prohibit by law, under severe penalties, the assembling of negroes in public bodies, especially at what are usually called "bush meetings."

UNPARALLELED CRUELTY TO A SLAVE.—We don't know when emotions of horror have been more excited in us than when we saw in a late paper the fact that the Legislature of Alabama had passed an act to emancipate Horatio King, a slave, who had built an excellent bridge over the Wetumpka river.—Poor King! Our heart bleeds for him! He felt that he had a soul above cotton picking, an intellect which enabled him to rise to an equality with the white race. He made the effort—succeeded, and for this he is condemned to perpetual freedom! Some one offered his master \$15,000 for him, with the intention no doubt of taking him to the slave's paradise—the "more congenial soil and climate" of Texas, but this happy lot was denied him! And now what shall he do? Shall he re-

about D. I

main at the South? Are not the free blacks more degraded than the slaves? Shall he come to the North? Does not John C. Calhoun tell us that in the free States the black race has "invariably sunk into vice and pauperism, accompanied by the bodily and mental infirmities incident thereto—deafness, blindness, insanity and idiocy to a degree without example; while in all other States which have retained the ancient relation between the races, they have improved greatly in every respect—in number, comfort, intelligence and morals?" What then shall he do?—With no kind master to keep his belly filled and his back covered at the cost of twenty dollars a year—with no sunny Texas to fly to—with no refuge at the North but pauperism, insanity and idiocy; poor Horatio King, the victim of freedom, must drag out an unhappy and cheerless life. And the Legislature of Alabama has done this fiendish deed! We have no words to adequately express our detestation of the act. The authors of it should be held up to public execration as the men who made an effort to do good a crime, and punished it with the lingering death of liberty.—*Manchester (N. H.) American.*

Communications.

THE BLOODY SOUTH.

John Hampden Pleasants saw the blighting influences of Slavery upon his native State, and raised his voice in opposition to it. In consequence of this he fell a victim to Slavery. He fell by the hands of those who, vulture like, prey upon mankind and fatten upon their miseries; who maintain their power over their victims by silencing all opposition by the use of the Bowie knife, the gun, the dirk, the lash, the thumb-screw and the manacle. Those whom these tyrants can enslave they whip into subjection; those whom they cannot enslave, they nominally free or free, they deprive of life. He fell by the hands of those whose malignant, fiend-like hate is vented alike upon all who raise their voices in opposition to their deeds of rapine and blood.

A few years since, Gardner, of Norfolk, took sides with the workingman, and spoke in opposition to the practice of having slaves to do the work of the U. S. Government in the navy yard at that place, and paying those who lived by plundering the laborer of his labor, instead of the men who performed the work. For this he was sacrificed. But Gardner was a Northern man, who had settled in Virginia and become an editor of a Norfolk paper. John Hampden Pleasants was a native of the Old Dominion, the son of a man who possessed the confidence of the people and an unbounded popularity, and who was for some time Governor of that State.

The son possessed commanding talents, and was probably, until his voice was heard in opposition to slavery, the most influential Whig editor south of the Potomac. But neither his talents, his influence, his birth-place, his standing in society, or the popularity of his family, was sufficient to save him. He fell a victim; and that smothered anti-slavery sentiment existing in the bosoms of Virginians, and which had begun occasionally to flash forth, has, it is to be feared, been silenced and intimidated by striking down the boldest, the most talented and influential of Slavery's opponents there.

I would ask what hopes have those who wish to see Slavery abolished, from a continuance of a union with these harpies? What can abolitionists expect to effect by the maintenance of that union with slaveholders who sacrifice every one that is, or can be got in their power, who array himself in opposition to their hellish practices?

I would say to those who are the supporters and defenders of that union, that aside from the guilt in which you are involved by such a union, by such a copartnership, and the consequent destruction of your influence for good, you cannot reasonably hope or expect to effect any thing for the emancipation of the slave by any opposition you can array against their dark deeds while you remain members of that slaveholding confederacy, that copartnership in second-hand slavery; but while you remain there, paralyzing on the one hand your influence for good by participation in deeds of darkness and crimes of the greatest magnitude—on the other hand, whenever you attempt to act against Slavery, you will be crowded down by a fierce, bold, and guilty band, which has heretofore, and will continue to overpower all opposition, and which stops at no crimes in the accomplishment of its purposes.

Your only reasonable hope of effecting any thing for the slave, is to sever your connection and dissolve your copartnership with slaveholders. Your only reasonable hope is, to refuse to remain in an association which, though called a free government, crushes the slave, outrages the rights of man and the Divine Majesty. Your only hope of emancipating the slave and yourselves from slavery, is to abandon a fraternity of fiend-like monsters, and do as you from aiding them, through your inglorious connection, to perpetrate their horrible system of oppression. If no man who is among the slave-claimants, however

influential he may be, can oppose Slavery and live, it is useless for you to hold out the idea that you can effect any good by being of them.

By way of exhortation, I would say to the anti-slavery men, to all of the North, if you would be free from the blackest guilt yourselves, if you would array yourselves in opposition to Slavery, cease to be of them and renounce all union with slaveholders.

SAM'L BROOKE.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

My friend B. B. Davis in your paper of the 6th inst., gravely informs us, that I am in error in supposing him to admit that "immorality and corruption exist in the Society of Friends, which it takes no measures to remove." Yet in the same communication he himself condemns the action of the Society in the case of I. T. Hopper and the Friends of Green Plain! Will B. B. D. contend that an act which he admits to be wrong—unjustifiable—unwarrantable—is at the same time perfectly moral? My friend will not vote for a slaveholder; he believes it wrong to do so. And yet, strange to say, he will not admit that there is any immorality in the act.

I confess that when I first read this part of B. B. D.'s communication, I was more surprised than I had been by any other sentiment which he has advanced during this discussion. When I reflect, however, that the position that the Society of Friends is a moral and Christian body is the only one which remains for my friend to take—the only ground which he can assume, without being condemned out of his own mouth—my astonishment is somewhat diminished. If I become responsible before the world for the conduct of another, knowing what that conduct is, I cannot for a moment claim to be innocent, if I admit the actions of that person to be immoral. My only escape is to deny their immorality, if I still persist in sanctioning them. If it were not that my friend has again and again admitted that the actions of the Society of Friends, and of its members in opposing the anti-slavery movement—denouncing anti-slavery members—voting for slaveholders, &c., &c., are wrong—unjustifiable—unwarrantable—and that every intelligent anti-slavery person admits the same—as if I thought it possible that any intelligent person could contend that what is in itself wrong, unjustifiable and unwarrantable may at the same time be perfectly moral and Christian, I might think it advisable to say more upon this part of the subject. As it is I deem it unnecessary.

B. B. D. attempts to show, that by the "admissions," as he calls them, made in my last communication, I have given up almost the whole ground. Those who will glance at the communication referred to, will see that he has but little in the shape of "admissions," to base this part of his argument. And those who do not want the trouble of hunting up old papers can see by the article itself, how little he has made out of these "admissions" whatever they may have been. He represents me as having said that Friends are not in heart "nor in intent" opposed to the reforms. In this he misrepresents me. If by reforms he means the Anti-Slavery and other reformatory movements as I suppose he does, I believe the Friends do intend as a body to oppose them, denying however that they are in reality reforms.

It will be remembered that B. B. D. stated in a former communication that he "scarcely believed the charges of 'pro-slavery,' 'anti-temperance,' &c., were applicable to the worst man in community"—again that "to be pro-slavery, means to be in favor of slavery," and that the word "has no other meaning." Supposing from this, that he did not conceive the word to be applicable to any but such as were in heart and profession, as well as in practice, the supporters of slavery, I stated that I had not charged Friends with being pro-slavery in this sense. As I understood him to define the word, I agree that it is not applicable to the worst man in this community, nor perhaps to one in ten of the slaveholders of the South. It was further stated that I had not charged the Society of Friends with having sunk to the lowest depths of immorality and corruption—as I believe that some of the other religious organizations are still more corrupt than that of Friends. Again, it was stated, that I judged no one's motives—that it was with *actions* not motives I had to do—that the actions of the Society of Friends were some of them pro-slavery, though for aught I knew, the motives might be good. I did not assert that the motives of the Friends in opposing Anti-Slavery, &c., were pure, for the reason that I knew nothing about them. I did not deny their purity for the same reason; and for the additional reason, that if I had known them it would have had nothing to do with the question under discussion.

These then are the "admissions" which B. B. D. supposes "divest the charges made against the Society of Friends of their whole force," except so far as intentional wrong is

concerned? He supposes it will not be asserted that the Society *does* know that it stands in the way of Anti-Slavery, Temperance, and Peace reforms. We do know, I reply, that persons standing highest in the Society have declared these movements to be of the devil—devised in the wisdom of this world—that Friends have been advised again and again to keep away from them—to shun them as they would shun destruction—that G. F. White and a host of other recommended ministers in both divisions of the Society, have for years, been doing every thing in their power to discountenance these reforms. B. B. D. has admitted all this and agrees with me that their course is wrong, whatever he may think of the motives which lead to it. My friend is altogether in error in expecting me to admit that the intention determines the character of an action. Slaveholding is a grievous wrong; a violation of all the rights of man. The fact of the person engaged in it, believing he has a right to the body and spirit of his brother man, does not change at all the character of the action. So of all other criminal acts; they are wrong in themselves, though they are doubtless sometimes committed without any evil motive. If it were true, as my friend seems to suppose, that the intention always determines the motive of an action, it would be nonsense to speak of men doing wrong intentionally.

It is probably true that many of those bigoted opposers of reform in the Society of Friends, as well as in other Societies, have the most perfect confidence that the Anti-Slavery movement is of the devil; and that in their opposition to it, and their persecutions of its advocates, they are fulfilling their duty. Many of them, I doubt not, verily think they are doing God service as Paul did when he persecuted the Christians; and belief on their part is just as good a reason for B. B. D. remaining in fellowship with them, as he would have had, if he had lived eighteen hundred years ago, for remaining in a similar Society, that should have joined with Paul in his principles and persecutions—and no better—other things being equal. Is the wrong of the Friends unintentional? so was that of Paul. Is the Society "a good field of labor?" The Society in the case supposed would have been the same. Every one will see, I believe, the weakness of my friend's argument here. He has shown that the pro-slavery acts of the Friends may be done with a good motive—giving the presumption that as many of the members as are honest, are better in heart than himself. For while they uphold that which they believe to be right, he, by his connection with them, gives countenance to that which he believes to be wrong.

My friend objects to the comparison of the sheep thief as not being in point. Let us see. He admitted certain acts of the Society to be wrong, but pointed me to other acts, and wished me to give credit. If I had asserted that the Friends were base in heart—that they delighted in wickedness and nothing else—he might have pointed me to those to prove them not wholly degraded. But such was not my position. I had endeavored to show that the Society committed and tolerated acts which were wrong in themselves. My friend without denying this, referred me to other acts of the Society; hence the comparison. He supposes I must know that there cannot be a thief without intentional wrong; to which I reply that I do not know this. For any thing I know, or believe, there may be, and have been, thefts committed without any evil motive. The degradation into which thousands are introduced at their birth, and reared and educated, is such that I think it less strange such persons should in some cases think it right to steal, than that among a people so intelligent and enlightened as the Society of Friends, a majority should be found ignorantly upholding a great system of "robbing and crime and blood," and opposing blindly those who are laboring successfully for its overthrow.

B. B. D. seems unable to see any "sense" in my other illustration. I did not intend to represent C, as being wicked in heart, but as committing acts which were criminal—though I confess my language here was not sufficiently explicit. I ask my friend to refer to the illustration once more and to suppose that C's conduct is criminal, and his motives unknown or even good. Will he inform your readers whether A and B in the first case (both having light) are not implicated in guilt, whatever may be the condition of C? Will he also inform us in the second case whether B can retain his connection with A and C, without sanctioning the wrong which he believes them to be doing, whatever he may think of their motives in doing it?

B. B. D. thinks he has applied the arguments used against the Friends, so as to prove the American A. S. Society pro-slavery, on the same grounds. He notices the fact that the Society opposing the Liberty party. If he believes that party to be the great Anti-Slavery movement, the main hope of the slave, he of course must consider any association or in-

dividual who opposes that party, so far pro-slavery in action. He must, with his views, think the same of those who use the proceeds of slave labor. He does not, however, by being a member of an Anti-Slavery Society, necessarily declare that those with whom he is acting, are moral and Christian in character and deportment. This he does by his connection with Friends, for that society declares by its actions, that to vote for slaveholders, oppose abolitionism, &c., are Christian acts, or, at least, that they are offenses of so trivial a nature, of so much less magnitude than that of marrying contrary to order, dressing as the people of the world do, joining Anti-Slavery and Temperance Societies, &c., that while it disowns persons for the latter, it breathes not even a whisper of reprobation against the former.

My friend asks whether Green Plain Friends did right in naming G. F. White, or in condemning themselves for doing so. I believe it was right for them to name him, and to protest against his course. He has not informed us for what fault they and I. T. Hopper were disowned. Does he believe they could have done any thing that would have satisfied Friends and enabled them to retain their standing in society, without violating principle—without doing a moral wrong?

I agree with B. B. D. in his first proposition, that society is useful in the advancement of religion and morality, provided, it is organized upon a proper basis. The truth of the second proposition I must be permitted to question. The organization of Friends has been for the last ten years, I believe, a hindrance to "growth in the truth" among its members, and in the world.

I differ with my friend, also, in relation to the third proposition. The deeds of the Society of Friends, go to the world as the usual action of the body, it being their profession to do every thing in unity. "If Friends think best I can submit," is the language used by those who at first express dissatisfaction with a proposed measure. Would my friend thus "submit" to a proposition to commit robbery or murder? The fact that a majority do not rule, does not, it seems to me, change the case, except it be to make it all the worse for my friend B. B. D.'s argument. He has himself told us that owing to this regulation, a few individuals may control the action of a whole meeting. This is often the case, but it is not done without the consent of the meeting. Who will pretend that when a wrong action is thus done, or an important duty left undone, only two or three persons are responsible?

J. BARNABY, Jr.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

Your correspondent, "L," or his advocate, appears again in your paper of the 6th inst. For convenience I will still call him "L."

I think this correspondent better at propounding, than at answering questions. This article of his comes in as a reply to mine of the 13th ult. Does "L." intend to answer my argument relative to the freebooter, the rascal, and other material points, by saying that my "vision" is so clear as to perceive that which is "by no means evident or reasonable to common minds?" As he has entirely omitted answering those propositions and interrogations which comprehend the main points at issue between us, this remark of his may, I presume, be accepted as the best answer the case would well admit of. But was not the point in controversy, whether or not Abolitionists could rightfully use slave labor products—and was not my article directed entirely to that point? Had "L." referred to my first reply he might have seen questions there answered which he raises anew, and it is strange that he should spend time combatting the idea that it is wrong to receive stolen goods for the purpose of restoring them to their true owner!

He says, however, "If he (the receiver) turns the theft to his own advantage he makes the crime his own." Does not a man who feeds and clothes himself with the fruits of slavery "turn" stolen goods "to his own advantage?" "L." will not say these goods do not come through an infinitely more objectionable channel than ordinary stolen goods; and if consuming them himself, is not turning them to his own advantage, he can easily escape this dilemma.

He talks about "recognizing the owner's claim." Suppose I turn pilferer, and purloin from the store doors along the streets of Salem, shoes, broadcloths, &c., and sell them to "L." He uses them or sells them again, knowing whence they came: but as he "recognizes" the right of the owner, he is of course guiltless. It may be asked, how he recognizes the right of the true claimant? By declaring that he believes the merchant to be the owner, and by preaching or publishing against theft? If this be not his answer, he will pardon me for anticipating him, as he has not yet seen fit to explain this subject.

"L." says, "whether we can obtain these

products from the slaveholder without increasing guilt, remains to be decided."

It has been "decided" that a man cannot give a just title to a farm to which he had never received a just one. If "L." can understand how the man who steals another man, and then steals the proceeds of his toil from him as fast as he earns it, can sell and convey a just title to such products, he will "confer" a fair way to establish his ground. It will be indeed fortunate for the slaveholder when it shall have become settled that the true friends of human liberty can, "without violating principle," barter with him for his booty, although they turn about, or there directly in his place, declare slaveholding the basest of villainies.

Can "L." give one reason why stolen horses might not be purchased with impunity on the same principle that he justifies buying slave produce?

Is the reason of its wrongfulness not in the inducement it affords for continuing the villainy? Does that reason not apply to the slaveholder?

I freely answer his interrogatories. He asks whether, if slavery were abolished to-day, it would be wrong to use its products remaining unconsumed. I answer, it would, unless there be an assurance that such an act would not encourage the re-establishment of slavery somewhere.

"L." wishes to know whether I would deem it admissible for him, provided he could with the consent of the slaveholder get an article, the fruit of his oppression, without compensating him, to receive and use it for the benefit of the slave.

If the slaveholder's consent could be had in the case, it would doubtless be right. But the question resolves itself into this:—If "L." can make an abolitionist of the slaveholder, and get him to relinquish his claim to the labor of his slave, would it be right to assist the latter in turning the whole of his labor to his own (the slave's) account? Ah right, most certainly—just what abolitionists ought to be at, constantly.

Yes, it is "imprudent," as well as wrong in principle, to divide the spoils with the slaveholder. If "L." can produce a plain proposition connected with abolition, than that slavery would diminish with the disuse of its products, I should be glad to hear it.

If "L." writes again, will he please not to introduce new propositions till he answers the old ones. It is best to not cut out too much work in advance.

HILLSDALE, Feb. 16th, 1846.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

I should be pleased to aid in extending the circulation of the "Bugle" and shall do so as far as my other duties will allow, as I approve much of its course, but not entirely that of all its correspondents; and you will excuse the freedom of a stranger if I tell you wherein any thing exceptional has met my eye, of the kind referred to. I will state, a correspondent in one of the papers you sent me, remarks in substance that the Liberty party "contributed to the elevation of Polk." Now I am not prepared to endorse the sentiment, although I shall never again act with that or any other party under the Government, as at present constituted. But still, admitting, for the sake of argument, that the independent party action of the Liberty party was such as to result in the elevation of Polk, are they responsible, in the sight of Heaven, for the sins of the latter? I think not. For even your correspondent must admit that if it is wrong to vote for Birney because we thereby recognize a piratical government, much more would it be wrong to vote for Clay, whereby we not only recognize the same kind of government as when we vote for Birney, but in addition commit the enormous offense of voting directly for a bloody-fingered and heaven-daring slave-claimant, and thereby put ourselves almost, I was about to say, out of the pale of common honesty, so that in the former instance, we are not so bad by at least one sin and that a sin of giant magnitude. Now it does not alter the fact that our action is overruled by Providence, to the elevation of another pirate of the same "stripe." The moral code of rectitude and honesty, requiring us to repudiate the claims of the insolent slave at the ballot-box, and every where else, forbids us in our tender tones from touching as contaminating a thing as Clay, if it should be with as elongated a concern as one of his own flag-staff, and this code is our rule of action, the Providence of God is not our rule of action. That law then requires us if we vote at all, to vote for a non-slaveholder, while in the meantime Providence (if I may so express myself,) votes for a slaveholder, for he elevates Polk. Now if by obeying the plain teachings of the moral law, we "contribute to the elevation" of an unpopular slaveholder, we ought hereafter to repudiate those teachings, and vote for some other slaveholder, whom we suppose not quite so bad, or in other words, begin to look out for consequences before we obey the plain dictates of com-

mon morality, not to say common honesty, which would be the reinstating in all its hated dimensions, of the long since exploded doctrine of expediency—a doctrine which I trust will be flouted by yourselves, as I doubt not it is, whenever and wherever you find it. No, I did not leave the Liberty party because I thought they "contributed to the elevation of Polk," but because they occupied a fallen position, and because their actions recognized a government which is a disgrace to the country in which we live, for its high-handed aggressions on the rights of the feeble and friendless African, whom a stern fate had cast upon her shores, and the sooner such a government is rent in millions of fragments, the better for civilization, the better for humanity. It cost me many a pang to assume this position, but I now take it fearless of men and devils, and I say with one of old, "sink or swim, survive or perish, I am for disunion" from all slaveholders at least, and from the Government too, as soon as practicable.

Parlon this freedom from a stranger, and believe me,

Yours for the right.

W. LYLE KEYS.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, MARCH 20, 1846.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chestnut sts.

"THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY."

The Editor of this paper seems considerably moved because of our query whether he would apply the same arguments to justify the connection of Joshua R. Giddings with a pro-slavery party as he did in vindication of Samuel Lewis' connection with a pro-slavery church. The first line of his article declares the Bugle to be "a Garrisonian organ." Had we called his paper a Birney organ, we could more readily account for his use of the term he applied to us, but in the absence of such reason, it looks—say the least—very like a dash of ill humor. The gist of his argument in the article referred to is this. Giddings electioneers for the Whig party, and endeavors to destroy the Liberty party; while Lewis sustains the Liberty party, and endeavors to overthrow the Whigs. The Liberty party is the only party, which seeks for the abolition of slavery, and if Lewis will do the work of that party, its members have no right to question his ecclesiastical relations—they have nothing to do with his religious views.

We do not however fully comprehend the character of Liberty party. We are aware it is rather chameleon-like in its nature—its different advocates describe it differently. Dr. Bailey of Cincinnati says it is purely a political party. E. Wade of the Reserve commences prayer as one of its measures, and declares that its members, as such, are bound to exercise all the individual and associated powers they conscientiously can, socially, morally, politically and religiously. R. C. Fieson of Pittsburgh contends that as a party it has nothing to do with a candidate's religious opinions, provided he does, or is willing to do the work of the party. The members of the recent Trumbull Co. Liberty party Convention, resolved they were as much determined as ever to oppose slavery socially, morally, and politically.

The editor of the Spirit of Liberty, a short time since could not see how any friend of the slave could be a member of such a church as disciplined McAbee—and that church was the M. E. On this hint we spoke, and gave him a gentle admonition because of his approval of the nomination of one of the preachers of that connection as Liberty party's gubernatorial candidate in Ohio. This brought from him a defence of the party in relation to Samuel Lewis. In reply we shall ask what are the general professions of that party, and what are the doctrines it teaches. 1st. It declares the inherent sinfulness of slavery, and contends that the ballot box is the means by which the slaves deliverance is to be wrought. 2nd. That membership in a pro-slavery political party is sufficient evidence that he who holds it is not fit to be entrusted with the interests of humanity. 3rd. That the candidates it nominates are every way worthy the confidence of Anti-Slavery men, and are the only candidates who are worthy.

Inasmuch as Liberty party contends for the inherent sinfulness of slavery, it is bound to draw the legitimate deduction from this premise, that all voluntary support of slavery is also sinful. That the church voluntarily shown by some of the leading members of that party, and its presidential candidate has even gone so far as to declare "The American Church, the Bulwark of American Slavery." Admitting, for the sake of argument,

that Church and State alike sustain the system, if the members of the party are consistent with their own principles they will be as ready to declare that membership in a pro-slavery church blinds a man's anti-slavery judgment, and chills his anti-slavery sympathies quite as much as connection with a pro-slavery political organization. When Liberty party presents a candidate to its members and asks for their support, they have an undoubted right, and it becomes their duty to enquire into the anti-slavery standing of that man. It is not enough, as some contend, that the candidate shall be willing to do the work of the party, to act as a machine for the organization, he should be a fair specimen of abolitionism. If this be not true, then is a mercenary political hack as good a candidate for the party, so far as principle is concerned, as the best man in its ranks. The members of the Liberty party stand upon the principle that they have as much right to question a man's religious and social, as his political standing and opinions; it is true they do not carry out their views very far in any but the last named, but the others they go as far as will answer their present purpose.

Suppose that Samuel Lewis at the time of the Columbus convention was the possessor in his wife's right of a slave plantation in Cuba, or owned a slave-trading vessel, or believed it was no violation of Christianity to hold slaves, yet upon the whole declared his desire to see the principles of Liberty party established in this land, inasmuch as they would be a pecuniary benefit to himself and country; would he have received the nomination? All will reply in the negative. But why? He avowed his willingness to do Liberty party work, and you know the party has no right to meddle with a man's religious opinions although slavery is a part of his creed; it has nothing to do with his commercial concerns although he may be engaged in the foreign slave trade; it has no business to ask what are his social relations although he has married a plantation of Cuba negroes. Now we are not aware that Samuel Lewis has given support to slavery in either of these ways, but he has done, and is doing that which does quite as much to sustain it. We say this, without intending to impugn his motives, or question his anti-slavery feelings, for we know so little of either that we will not venture to speak of them here; our remarks are based upon what we know of his ecclesiastical position. By that position, he endorses not only the Christian character of every Methodist slaveholder, but declares that slavery is not opposed to Christianity, that it is no hindrance to the progress of the gospel, for the church with which he is connected not only as a member but a minister has disavowed all right, wish or intention to destroy it. The language of his actions is, "The Bishops of Christ's church are so corrupt and pro-slavery that no abolitionist ought to give them his vote for the meanest office; yet will I reverence them as Bishops ordained of God."

If Liberty party voters may not inquire into the ecclesiastical character of the candidate they are called upon to support, so far as his relation to slavery is concerned; if they dare not ask whether the practical endorsement of slavery as Christian does not disqualify a man from becoming a Liberty party nominee, we must change our estimate of the character of that party, and regard it as a blindly despotic as any other in the land. If a church is organized to put down man-stealing, it is not bound to inquire whether the preacher to whom it is about to extend a call is one who legalizes man-steal, and if so, to refuse to receive him? Some would perhaps say that this was meddling with a political affair, a concern with which the church has no business. So, on the other hand, if a political party is organized to put down man-stealing, it is not bound to inquire whether the man it is about to present as its candidate for office is one who endorses the Christian character of the man thief! This, the Spirit of Liberty regards as "a deceptive issue," but it is an issue which the honest men of the party will sooner or later make; for it is impossible to prevent the true friends of the slave from looking at a man's entire character. They will not be satisfied with the political page, but will turn the leaf to know if his religious, is as good as his political life.

REORGANIZATION OF LIBERTY PARTY.

The last Spirit of Liberty contains a communication which, taken in connection with the editor's remarks upon the same subject, is something more than a straw to show the course of the wind. The article referred to, proposes a reorganization of Liberty party. The writers demonstrate the great improbability that Liberty party, as at present organized, can effect the overthrow of Slavery; they contend that a party cannot be built up whose power will be sufficient to accomplish this, unless it embraces other principles of

political reform than anti-slavery. They suggest that the basis upon which the new party be founded shall be—

1. The Abolition of Slavery as the paramount object.
2. Equal Political and Civil Rights. The abolition of all monopolies and special privileges.
3. A thorough Reform of the Judiciary system.
4. The Election of all National and State Officers so far as practicable.
5. The Reduction of Salaries to as low a rate as will secure suitable incumbents.
6. The gradual reduction of the Army and Navy, with a view to their abolition as soon as circumstances render it advisable.
7. A Tariff for Revenue at present, and as the expenses of the nation become reduced, its gradual abolition and a direct tax substituted.
8. The Reduction of the Post-Office Tax. Messrs. Beckley and Foster, from whom the above proposition emanates, are editors of the Signal of Liberty, at Ann Arbor, Michigan. They state that James G. Birney and hundreds of Liberty men agree with them in their views. The editor of the Spirit of Liberty fully endorses them, and proposes as an amendment to the proposition, that—
9. The Public Lands be made free to every landless man, for occupation, without let or hindrance.
10. The adoption of the "Ten Hour System" of labor in all occupations and branches of business.

Such an organization as that proposed, it is true, would be very different from the present Liberty party; but as that party is now stationary, even if it be not rapidly on the decline, it seems necessary for its supporters to cast about for a title upon which to build another; and under the embarrassing circumstances which now surround them, it is perhaps the only thing they can do to save their political credit. The adoption of such a measure will be an abandonment of their position; and though they march forth from the garison with drums beating and flags flying, it will not be as conquerors. Had they not far better throw their political gods to the moles and bats, and join with those who are swelling the battle cry of "No union with SLAVEHOLDERS!"

MEETINGS IN SALEM.

Stephen S. and Abby Kelley Foster will hold meetings in this place on Sunday and Monday the 29th and 30th inst., commencing on Sunday at 2 P. M. at the Friends Meeting House. They expect to have four or five sessions. They will also be at New Lisbon on the 2nd and 3rd of April, and at East Fairfield on the 5th and 6th. Those who wish to meet these devoted friends of the slave again, it is to be hoped will be in attendance. The three meetings above named are the last they will hold in the State before leaving for the East.

A member of the Ex. Committee of the O. A. S. Society, desires us to request that Committee to convene at Salem at the time of the above named meeting.

The correspondent at Pine Grove who propounds certain inquiries shall receive attention, probably, next week.

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE.

The Southern Democratic politicians are now looking with much interest toward New Hampshire, where a State election will soon occur. The division lately made there in the Democratic ranks by the manly and independent course of John P. Hale, is regarded by the South as an event of ill omen. The Democracy of New Hampshire was slavery's Gibraltar; the representatives of that State who rejoiced in the cognomen of Democrat, were among the most vile and truckling of politicians, always ready to choke down freedom of speech, or do any work at Slavery's bidding, no matter how low and degrading. John P. Hale broke the charm, and for this is denounced by "the faithful" as a traitor. His course has been such as to open the eyes of many honest, well meaning men, who have stood by him in the attempt to regain his former place in Congress, which the slavery-ridden members of his party are sworn to prevent. The subjoined extract from the letter of a Washington correspondent of the Manchester Independent Democrat, reveals something of the game the South is playing. We suppose it is exceedingly proper for Southern men to use bribes and threats in order to influence a northern election, but the height of impropriety for a Northern man to so far interfere with "the peculiar institution," as to inquire by what right three millions of American citizens, all of whom were born in strict conformity with the Declaration of Independence, are deprived of the free exercise of their inalienable rights by other American citizens, and held as chattel slaves.

The result of your last election astonished every body here; and nobody more than the New Hampshire delegation. On your next

election all eyes are turned. And were it not for violating the confidence of private intercourse, I could tell you of some other things which nearly affect your present position. Every thing that money and the patronage of the government here can do, will be done to break down the friends of Mr. Hale. At this time, a large sum of money is being raised among the office-holders and certain Southern members of Congress, for these purposes of your election. It is this golden fleece which drew so many of your Democratic editors to this city in the early part of the session. One of the Virginia members said to me yesterday, "I have forty as good niggers as ever hood tobacco; and I had rather hear to-morrow that every mother's son of them lay a corpse on my plantation, than that John P. Hale should come his d—d abolition stuff in New Hampshire."

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.

Pursuant to a public call, a meeting of those opposed to American Slavery, convened in Salem, March 11th, 1846; whereupon Jacob Heaton was appointed Chairman and I. Trescott Secretary of the Convention.

A Committee of ten was appointed to prepare business for the future sittings of the Convention, viz: M. H. Urquhart, Samuel Brooke, Danl. McCurdy, Jno. Harris, A. G. Kirk, Caroline Stanton, Mary Holloway, Henrietta C. Marshall, Maria Garrigue, Jane M. Trescott, were appointed said Committee.

The business Committee reported the following resolutions, which, after discussion from M. H. Urquhart, B. S. Jones, J. E. Jones, Wm. B. Irish, J. Heaton, J. H. Paine, J. McMillan, Samuel Brooke, Dr. Stanton, I. Trescott and others, were adopted:

Resolved, That in the judgment of this meeting, Slavery, or the holding property in man, is a gross sin against God, a grievous wrong to man, an unmitigated curse to the community in which it exists—calling in thunder tones to every friend of God and humanity to be diligent in the use of every instrumentality that may be rightfully applied for its entire overthrow.

Resolved, That the existence of Slavery in a professed Christian land, and in a government based on the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence, and regulated by a Constitution ordained for the purpose of "establishing justice and securing the blessings of liberty," is a deep disgrace to the professors of that religion, and the citizens of that government, from which none can be delivered who are not engaged in earnest and unwearying efforts for its removal both from Church and Nation.

Resolved, That the great parties, in whose hands has heretofore been placed the administration of our governments of the state of Ohio and National, by their entire subservience to the slave power, have forfeited all right to the countenance and support of those who entertain correct notions of their moral and political responsibilities.

Resolved, That Slavery in itself is a heinous sin against God, a gross outrage upon man in the beginning, continuation and ending, in all its parts and relations; because it is a flagrant violation of every item in the decalogue proclaimed by God from Sinai for the government of man.

Resolved, That the amount of information which has been diffused, the incontestable truths which have been spread out in startling array before the public, showing with vividness the abominations incident to the slave trade and slave holding—the sad and terrible consequences to all the sacred relations of human life are such that no man is guiltless who continues ignorant of the wretchedness of the slave, the relations that he sustains to the bleeding bondman, and his duty to labor for his deliverance.

Whereas, the State of Ohio has promised protection to her citizens, who owe her allegiance, and has failed to furnish that protection to the lamented Jno. B. Mahan, and more recently, the three citizens abducted and imprisoned in Parkersburg jail;

And Whereas, these persons, thus unjustly thrust into prison, were exposed to vexatious and costly litigations;

And Whereas, Thomas, Gardner, and Lorain, are poor men, who have families dependant on them for support;

And Whereas, our brother Mahan has left a widow and fatherless children, who are now dependant on the cold charities of the community, the husband and father having expended all his property, about \$3500, in defending his liberty in a foreign court, where he was dragged through perjury; and the shameful haste of delivering him up, by the authorities of the State of Ohio, having failed to furnish the guaranteed protection, therefore

Resolved, That we therefore pledge ourselves to continue to petition the Legislature from year to year, until the State shall do justice to these much injured fellow citizens.

Resolved, That although the friends of the slave may differ in relation to the requisitions of the Constitution, and their duties under the United States Government, yet we wish our friends both at the South and the North distinctly to understand, that whether we are Liberty men, co-operators or stay-inners, we will not aid the slave-claimant to recover the fugitive slave, but we pledge ourselves to assist him in his fight, or protect him while among us—that in case the slave resists the authority of the master, should we be called upon by the government under a construction of the Constitution, that we ought to assist the master against the slave, we will in no such case comply with the requisition.

Resolved, That so long as the fearful contest is waged in this country between liberty and slavery, and until the last foul blot of oppression is obliterated from our statute books and Constitutions, and until the public sentiment in relation to slavery is purified and redeemed, we re-pledge ourselves to use all the power that we conscientiously can, to redeem our country, politically, morally and religiously, from the curse of slavery.

Resolved, That the Secretary write out the proceedings of the meeting and offer them for publication in the Village Register, with a request that the Bugle and Philanthropist copy.

The following resolutions were offered but not passed.

Resolved, That the apologies which have been offered in years gone by for those who ignorantly assisted in spreading and upholding this terrible institution by ecclesiastical and state covenants, are no longer admissible, because all men now know or ought to know the damning guilt of countenancing or apologizing for those who are guilty of the "sum of all human villainies."

Resolved, That those churches who continue still in fellowship, by regarding as good Christians, those men who now sin willfully, knowingly, with a reckless disregard of all the sacred rights of humanity, by weaving sophistical apologies for slavery, and by co-operating with slave-holders for the spread of the gospel, have forfeited every claim to the name of Christian churches, and expose themselves to the merited derision of the virtuous and Christian community.

Resolved, That the party claiming to be exclusively Democratic, by the nomination as its gubernatorial candidate, of David Ton, a man, who, while a member of the Senate of Ohio, evinced his hatred of the principles of justice and republicanism, by voting against the right of petition, and in favor of that odious and unconstitutional Black Law, dictated by Kentucky despots, shows its determination to continue, as heretofore, the natural ally of the slave power.

Resolved, That the Whig party of Ohio, which for two years past, have represented themselves as the "true Liberty party," have shown more clearly their pro-slavery propensities, as well as their damning hypocrisy, by refusing in the Legislature to repeal the black code of our state; by holding up, in their recent State Convention, "the character" and "services" of HENRY CLAY, the great dualist, slave-holder, Missouri compromiser, and author of Arkansas slavery, "as an example for emulation to future statesmen and patriots;" and in the same Convention, by refusing to lip one word of indignation against the outrage upon the rights of Ohio and her citizens, perpetrated by the slaveholders and the slave power of Virginia.

Resolved, That while we sincerely hope that the parties named in the two preceding resolutions, after having assumed the pro-slavery position which they now occupy, will not insult honest men by asking their suffrage; but that, should our hopes in this respect not be realized, we will repel the insult with that contempt which impudence of such magnitude justly merits.

Resolved, That the Liberty party of Ohio, in nominating Samuel Lewis as their gubernatorial candidate, while he is in connection with and upholding a church that upholds and sustains slavery, prove that they are not the consistent advocates of universal liberty.

Resolved, That he who goes to the ballot-box, is bound by the most solemn obligations, to use his elective franchise for the election of those who will wield their official influence for the removal of the wrong and the establishment of the right, and that to vote for slaveholders, or for those who will sustain the slave power and its interests, is to manifest a total disregard of the most sacred duties Heaven requires at our hands.

J. HEATON, Pres.

I. TRESCOTT, Sec.

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETINGS.

STEPHEN S. and ABBY KELLEY FOSTER will hold meetings at Hartford, Trumbull Co. Tuesday and Wednesday the 24th and 25th. Youngstown, Trumbull Co. Friday the 27th.

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS.

Persons wishing to furnish themselves with anti-slavery Books and Pamphlets, can do so by calling on J. EDWARD JONES, one door west of the District School House, Green St.

J. MCCLURE, & Co.

DEALERS in Produce, No. 11 Front St. between Main and Walnut, Cincinnati, Ohio.

DRY GOODS AND GROCERIES.

BOOTS and SHOES, (Eastern and Western.) Drugs and Medicines, Paints, Oil and Dye Stuffs, cheap as the cheapest, and good as the best, constantly for sale at

TRESCOTT'S.

Salem, O. 1st mo. 30th.

CARRIAGES—CARRIAGES.

SPRING is coming, and people begin to talk about buying carriages. The subscriber still carries on the carriage business at his old stand on Main street, in Salem, and, having taken special pains in the selection of his stock, he is prepared to fill any order in his line of business, fancying himself able to give satisfaction to the most fastidious taste or humble means.

Also, a large and excellent assortment of finished carriages constantly on hand, which will be sold to suit the times, and warranted to purchasers.

DAVID WOODRUFF.

February 27th, 1846.

AGENTS FOR THE "BUGLE."

Ohio. New Garden—David L. Galbreath. Columbiana—Lot Holmes. Cool Springs—T. Ellwood Vickers. Berlin—Jacob H. Barnes. Marietta—Dr. K. G. Thomas. Canfield—John Wetmore. Lovellette—Dr. Butler. Poland—Christopher Lees. Youngstown—J. S. Johnson. New Lyme—Margaret Miller. Akron—Thomas P. Beach. New Lisbon—George Garretson. Cincinnati—William Donaldson. East Fairfield—John Marsh. Selma—Thos. Swann. Springfield—Ira Thomas. Harveysburg—V. Nicholson. Oakland—Elizabeth Brock. Chagrin Falls—S. Dickenson. Malta—James Cope. Columbus—W. W. Pollard. Georgetown.—Ruth Cope. Bandyburg—Alex. Glenn. Garrettsville—J. H. Parles. Waterloo—E. Morgan Parrott.

Indiana. Greensboro—Lewis Branson. Marion—John T. Morris. Economy—Ira C. Maulsby. Liberty—Edwin Gardner. Winchester—Clarkson Pocket. Knightstown.—Dr. H. L. Terrill. Richmond—Joseph Adleman.

Pennsylvania. Fallston—Joseph Conle. H. Vanhon, Pittsburgh.

POETRY.

From the Democratic Review for March.
TO RONGE.

BY J. G. WHITTIER.

Strike home, strong-hearted man!—Down
To the root
Of old Oppression sink the Saxon steel.
Thy work is to hew down. In God's name
then
Put nerve into thy task. Let other men
Plant, as they may, that better tree, whose
fruit
The wounded bosom of the Church shall
heal.
Be thou the Image-breaker. Let thy blows
Fall heavy as the Saxon's Iron Hand.
On Crown or Cross, which shall interpose
Between thee and the weal of Father-
land.
Leave creeds to closet-idlers. First of all,
Shake thou all German dream-land with the
fall
Of that accursed tree, whose evil trunk
Was spared of old by Erfurt's stalwart monk:
Fight not with ghosts and shadows. Let us
hear
The snap of chain-links. Let our gladdened
ear
Catch the pale prisoner's welcome, as the
light
Fellows thy ax-stroke, through his coil of
night.
Be faithful to both worlds; nor think to
feed
Earth's starving millions with the husks
of creed:
Servant of Him whose mission high and
holy,
Was to the wronged, the sorrowing and
the lowly,
Thrust not his Eden promise from our
sphere.
Distant and dim beyond the blue sky's
span;
Like him of Patmos, see it, now and
here—
The New-Jerusalem comes down to
man!
Be warned by Luther's error. Nor like
him,
When the roused Tenton dashes from
his limb
The rusted chain of ages, help to bind
His hands, for whom thou claim'st the free-
dom of the mind.

From the London Nonconformist.

THE SLAVE TRADE.

Oh! 'twas a dark and fatal hour when man
First stole his fellow, and, for sordid gold,
His brother into dreadful bondage sold;
For then new miseries to the race began.
What untold millions have been swept away
By fierce and bloody war, and scorching
flame,
And endless treacheries without a name,
To glut man's avarice, and become his prey!
Thy plains, O Africa! are covered o'er
With bleached bones, and relics of that host
Who fell, heart-broken, ere they reached the
coast.
And thou, great Ocean! if thy mighty roar
Could speak of after horrors, would'st unfold
A tale of crime, too fearful to be told!

During our visit to the Massachusetts
State Prison some time since, the Warden
spoke with deep interest of a prisoner whose
talents as a Poet had excited much attention.
We find the following lines from his pen in
"The Prisoner's Friend." Our readers will
agree with us in pronouncing them very beau-
tiful.—Tribune.

THE PRISONER'S ADDRESS TO HIS MOTHER.

I've wandered far from thee, mother,
Far from our happy home;
I've left the land that gave me birth,
In other climes to roam;
And time, since then, has rolled his years,
And marked them on my brow—
Yet still I've often thought of thee—
I'm thinking of thee now.
I'm thinking of those days, mother,
When with such earnest pride,
You watched the dawning of my youth,
And pressed me to your side;
Then love had filled my trusting heart
With hopes of future joy,
And thy bright fancy honors wove
To deck thy darling boy.
I'm thinking on the day, mother,
I left thy watchful care,
When thy fond heart was lifted
To Heaven—thy trust was there;
And memory brings thy parting words,
When tears fell o'er thy cheek;
But thy last loving, anxious look,
Told more than words could speak.
I'm far away from thee, mother,
No friend is near me now,
To soothe me with a tender word,
Nor cool my burning brow;
The dearest ties affection wove,
Are all now torn from me;
They left me when the trouble came—
They did not love like thee,
I would not have thee know, mother,
How brightest hopes decay—
The temper, with his baneful cup,
Has dashed them all away;
And shame has left its venom'd sting,
To rack with anguish wild!
I would give my tender heart to know
The sorrows of thy child.
I'm lonely and forsaken now,
Unpitied and unloved;
Yet still, I would not have thee know
How sorely I'm distressed;
I know thou would'st not chide, mother,
Thou would'st not give me pain,
But cheer me with thy softest words,
And bid me hope again.
I know thy tender heart, mother,
Still beats as warm for me.

As when I left thee, long ago,
To cross the broad blue sea;
And I love thee just the same, mother,
And I long to hear thee speak,
And feel again thy balmy breath,
Upon my care-worn cheek.

But ah! there is a thought, mother,
Pervades my beating breast—
That thy freed spirit may have flown
To its eternal rest;
And, as I wipe the tear away,
There whispers in mine ear
A voice, that speaks of Heaven and thee,
And bids me seek thee there. C. M.

MISCELLANEOUS.

From the Cincinnati Herald.

THE CONVICT'S DAUGHTER.

The reading of an article in one of our late
monthly on Capital Punishment, brought
vividly to mind a scene through which I
passed in childhood. As it was my privi-
lege to spend that golden period of life in
the country, I will conduct my readers to
one of the most beautiful agricultural dis-
tricts in Western New-York, though now it
is dotted over with thriving towns. The
song of the robin, the lowing of herds, and
the whistle of the plow-boy, have given place
to the din of commerce, the whirl of machin-
ery, and the hum of a busy multitude.

Most of the inhabitants of the town of
N— claimed a puritanic origin, and sus-
tained the claim by their industry, frugality
and intelligence. The clumsy looking but
commodious school-house was the best build-
ing in the school district, except the church,
whose tall spire rose from a copse of aspiring
poplars. These all important buildings, with
the parsonage half buried in rose-bushes, the
white cottage of the schoolmaster, and a few
mechanics' shops, constituted what the good
people called *The Centre*. Hard by this focus
of civilization lived good Deacon Jones, the
most important light in the constellation.
Mr. Fielding, the schoolmaster, was skilled
in the use of globes and birchen rods. The
parson could preach an excellent sermon.
Yet in all matters pertaining to time and
sense, Deacon Jones was the oracle, and
never was an honor more judiciously confer-
red or more meekly borne.

But perhaps the most interesting character
of that time and place was Miss Huldah, an
unmarried daughter of Deacon Jones. For
twenty years she had resolutely turned a deaf
ear to the sighs of adoring swains, simply
because she was already happy and useful.
Were she to leave her parents in their old
age, she was sure they would miss her sadly,
and not one of all the poor or "sick in the
neighborhood" could spare her." Her kind
parents would not ask her to remain with
them, lest it should be a sacrifice; neverthe-
less they smiled approvingly upon her volun-
tary decision. Though Miss Huldah abjured
matrimony for herself, she had an encourag-
ing word and a ready hand for those of her
friends who were differently disposed. In-
deed she was the presiding genius at all the
weddings and merry makings; nor was her
presence of less importance in cases of affliction
and bereavement. As no one else could
arrange the apartments for a wedding, or
place the white rose in the hair of the bride
so tastefully as Miss Huldah; neither could
any other speak so soothingly to the bereav-
ed, so well attach the sable badge to the hab-
itations of the mourner, or so piously fold
the hands and adjust the shroud of the un-
conscious sleeper.

As there is no picture without its dark
shades, so there is no community, however
pure in the main, without its exceptional
characters—characters on which sin has fixed
its dire impress, and wrought its legitimate
results. Individuals who "sow the wind
reap the whirlwind."

This undesirable member of a Christian
community afflicted the good people of N—
in the person of James O'Brien, an Irish em-
igrant of the middle class. When he came
to N— he was a fine looking man of 23,
frank and generous, with his wit and keen
perception of the ludicrous so common among
his countrymen. These qualities gained him
many friends. But they soon learned that
he was passionate, and fatally in love with
the intoxicating cup.

Mary O'Brien was a person of less mental
capacity than her husband, but more amiable.
Her patient kindness often soothed his per-
turbed spirit, but failed to reform his habits.

They had but one child. And such a child!
The intellect, goodness and beauty usually
distributed through a large family, seemed
concentrated in little Nora O'Brien. She in-
herited the bright intellect and ardent tem-
perament of her father, with all the winning
gentleness of her mother; while in person
she was a prodigy of beauty. She was one
of those beings whose mission to this earth
is like that of the flower and the dew-drop,
and whose very presence excites thoughts of
a purer world. She was a general favorite,
and happy for being so sensitive, so gifted,
that a mother's approving smile and loving
tone, the light and music of childhood, were
not wanting. As Mary O'Brien prepared her
child for school, watched her reeling form,
and thought of her until she returned, it is
difficult to say whether love or pride predom-
inated, as her beauty and amiability passed
in review before her mind's eye. James O'-
Brien also loved his child, and her influence
fell upon him silent and pure as the snow
flake. But, alas for that man in whose soul
love hath so far lost its power that nature's
holiest ties fail to restrain from sinful indul-
gence.

As all of O'Brien's faults grew out of his
love for intoxicating drinks, great efforts were
made to subvert these bonds of steel by which
long indulgence had bound him to this vile
habit. When the friends of Temperance put
forth their first effectual effort in the circu-
lation of the pledge to "abstain from distilled
liquors," James was urged to avail himself
of its benefits. "Never a bit of it," said
Jimmy, as Deacon Jones put down his own
name, and handed him the pen. "And can't
I as well be after having the cratur without
writing my name on a bit of paper?" Pos-
sibly he might have tried the experiment,

had there been no town meetings or militia
trainings, or any thing else to draw such per-
sons into that vortex of temptation, where
respectable men coolly, deliberately, and for
a very slight compensation, deal out poison
to their fellows; not ignorantly, O no—but
after having demonstrated its nature and ef-
fects upon the human system. A victim of
this murderous cupidity, O'Brien was becom-
ing out of doors what is termed a "rowdy,"
while in his own family he seemed little
changed. He was an excellent mechanic,
and though he worked irregularly, his earn-
ings sufficed to supply the simple wants of a
small family. Mary O'Brien, noting the in-
creased irritability of her husband's temper,
added to her own patience and equanimity,
while she so far concealed his faults from
Nora, that she treated him with all confidence
and affection due to the best of fathers. She
had entered her thirteenth year. Her con-
tinued filial piety added lustre to her other
charms in the eyes of parents, while the
children loved her for the same reason that
they loved the sunshine and flowers.

In the autumn of 1825, the farmers of N—
decided that there must be a squirrel hunt.
"A squirrel hunt!" exclaims some modern
school-boy, "what can that be?" I will try
to describe it. It often happens that when
the Indian corn begins to ripen, that long be-
fore it is fit for the granary of the farmer, that
the provident squirrel family commence gath-
ering their winter's store. The farmer deems
their conduct unpardonable. He frots and
fumes while these industrious little people,
day by day, fill their sack-like cheeks with
the golden grains, and away over fence and
field, deposit them in their tiny store rooms.
What is to be done? A council of war is
called, at which the farmers preside. "These
aggressors," say they, "must be punished,
the wrong redressed, our dignity sustained,"
or else these squirrels, because they can run
the fastest, might think themselves the larg-
est and the bravest people. "Come, let's
fight them, let's kill them," exclaim these
friends of national honor, the lovers of sport,
of glory and revenge. Hostilities being de-
termined upon, a day is set for the attack,
companies formed, and preparations for a
good supper for the victors duly made. A
day or two intervene, in which all the old
firearms are summoned from their repose, bur-
nished and put in readiness for the coming
action. The earliest dawn of the appointed
day reveals parties of men and boys in hos-
tile array, scouring the country in every di-
rection. The sharp note of the rifle soon re-
sounds through all the green chambers of
the forest.

It was at the close of a day's sport com-
menced in this manner, that James O'Brien
got into a dispute about some trifling matter,
with a Dutchman named Veeder. O'Brien
had drunk enough to make him furious, while
Veeder was indebted to his favorite beer for
a large share of his stubbornness and stupid-
ity. The dispute ran high; O'Brien seized
his rifle, (he had been shooting all day,) his
finger touched the trigger—poor Veeder fell
lifeless. All eyes were now turned to the
scene. Men of ordinary sensibility stood
petrified. O'Brien pressed his hand against
his burning forehead, as if to determine what
he had done; until a gentleman presiding in
one corner of the room, behind a few rows of
shelves, garnished with an array of bright
glass bottles, called out, "Seize him, seize
the murderer!" Poor James O'Brien was
accordingly hurried away to the county seat,
duly deposited in jail, and there left to his
own reflections. The news of James O'-
Brien's crime and confinement spread through
the neighborhood with characteristic rapidity.
But among all the lovers of the horrible,
there was not one of sufficient nerve to ap-
prize Mrs. O'Brien and her daughter of their
dread calamity. The next morning Miss
Huldah was selected as the most suitable
person to perform this unpleasant duty. She
therefore broke the news to them as gently
as the case admitted. Mrs. O'Brien, being a
proficient in the school of endurance, bore
the intelligence better than had been expect-
ed. While to Nora, the shock was doubly
severe, revealing the extent of her father's
disipation with its awful close.

The first wild paroxysm of grief being
passed, her fine constitution and grateful
spirits enabled her to rally, and in a few
days she resumed her place in school, and
seemed to study with her usual interest.
But the bright rose color had left her cheek,
and her glad laugh no longer enlivened our
sports. The scholars manifested the deepest
sympathy for her, though they never men-
tioned the cause of her sorrow. There was
the kindly greeting, the waiving of rights
and privileges in her behalf, among those of
her own age; while the little ones divided
with her their treasure of nuts and apples.

Nora was at school, as usual, on the day
of her father's trial. As the day waned her
face became expressive of the deepest anx-
iety. It happened that I walked home with
Nora that evening—it was mid-winter. The
last rays of the sun lingered upon the snow-
clad hills. Just as we reached Deacon Jones'
house, a sleigh, in which was seated the
good deacon and several of his neighbors,
came up from the opposite direction, and
drove into the farm-yard. The thought pain-
fully struck me that they had just returned
from attending the trial, but hoped that Nora
did not so understand it. We passed the
house a few rods, when Nora stopped sud-
denly, and turning to me, said, "Helen,
those men are just from L—. They must
know the result of my father's trial. Do,
Helen, go in and find out all about it, for I
am dying of suspense. Do go, that's a kind,
good girl, and I will stay here." So saying
the action to the word, she threw herself up-
on a snow bank that formed a graceful slope
from the fence to the path where we were
standing. To the excuse which I offered,
she only replied, "Go, go," in a voice so
husky and imperative, that nothing was left
me but obedience.

I reached Miss Huldah's sitting-room just
in time to hear her make all the inquiries of
her father which I had come expressly to
hear answered.
I learned from the evidence, and the charge
to the jury, there seemed no doubt but that
the prisoner would be executed; but the jury
having been out several hours, could not

agree, two of them thinking some better dis-
position could be made of a man—an able
mechanic in middle life—than to take from
him life, that God-given boon, and hang him
up an object of scorn—a demoralizing spec-
tacle—to a gaping multitude. But as the
ten jurors, among whom was one distiller
and three dealers in ardent spirits, were sup-
ported by a strong public sentiment in favor
of the execution, it was more than probable,
to use a cant expression of the times, that
"justice would be done."

With a heavy heart I hastened back to
Nora. She had thrown her head back upon
the snow-drift; and her hood having fallen
slightly back, revealed the rich Auburn curls
that shaded her face. Her hands were con-
vulsively clasped, and her eyes closed. On
hearing my footsteps she sprang to her feet,
saying, "Now tell me—tell me all." I told
her that the case had not been decided. She
had but to turn her eyes on me to discover
that I had heard more than I was willing to
communicate. Grasping my hand with an
energy that startled me, she repeated, "Tell
me all—every thing they said. If my father
must die by the cord of the hangman—the
scorn of the wicked, the horror of the good,
I may as well know it now. I know he has
committed an awful crime. Yet, (lowering
her voice as if talking to herself,) it was not
my father. It was the spirit that was in him,
and the rascal must answer it. Yes, as
God is just, the blood of the innocent shall
be required at his hands!" There was a
brightness in the eye—a firmness of voice—an
energy of manner, all unlike the gentle
Nora.

With childish fondness I told her all that
I had heard. She thanked me with a quiv-
ering lip for the trouble I had taken, and we
bent our steps homeward.

The next day, James O'Brien was senten-
ced to execution in six weeks. Six weeks
may be a long time to the voyager as he
nears home, or to the expectant of some long
deprived home. But to the candidate for the
honor of dangling in mid-air for the benefit
of the instruction, the warning of his fellow
men, or to his broken-hearted friends, it is
far otherwise. To Nora it was but the space
of a troubled dream, yet leaving the foot-
prints of years. Consumption may spare
the beauty of its victim—it is the body only
that decays. The soul looks out sunnily
from bright eyes that refuse to look upon
death, and the trusting heart sends its ex-
pression of hope to the hectic cheek. But
grief is the cancer of the mind, and beneath
its sway the traces of beauty fade as rapidly
as the shadows of night come down upon the
earth. When hope is blighted, the light of
the soul goes out, and the wringing of the
heart will trace sad lines in the sweetest
face.

Nora passed the few remaining days of her
father's probation in moody silence, seldom
speaking, seldom even weeping. On the
day of the execution, as the clock struck the
appointed hour, she threw herself upon a set-
tee, burying her face in the pillow. Some
minutes passed in silence, when Miss Hul-
dah spoke to her in the kindest accents, but
no answer came. "Nora, my dear," said
her mother, as she wiped the tears from her
own eyes—yet all was still. They raised
her head. The heart-strings, too tightly
drawn, had snapped—Death had released the
stricken spirit.

The next day I attended the funeral. Hos-
pitable Deacon Jones allowed the orphan a
resting place in his family burying ground.
Her mother, the sole mourner, followed with
the air of one to whose eye every green thing
has perished from the earth, and every light
gone out from the sky. A solemn pine,
decked with the jewels of the frost-king,
spread its protecting arms over the grave, a
fit emblem of one whose bright hopes were
formed to melt away.

I almost forgot to say that the execution
was witnessed by the usual great multitude,
the profligate and profane forming the inner
circle. The morality of the witnesses in-
creased with the distance from the tragedy,
until upon the brow of an overhanging hill,
stood the good parson of N—, with his
face turned not heavenward.

AN EASY WAY TO SETTLE A QUARREL.

Recently, in a thickly settled place, the
boys of one portion became so much at vari-
ance with those of another contiguous por-
tion, that they entered into a regular combi-
nation on each side, that if those of the one
could catch a boy from the other party, they
would whip him severely. Things went on
so for a considerable time, and many were
the fights that came off between these little
bravoes. At length, Charles, a lad belonging
to one of the neighborhoods, was one day at
play with his kite. As he proudly mounted
up, the wind grew too strong for the line,
which consequently broke, and away went
the kite down into the other neighborhood.
Charles of course durst not go after it, for it
had fallen among boys who were hostile to
him. John, one of them, seized the toy and
broke it up, and then sent a taunting word
to Charles about what he had done; and that if
he would come over he would serve him the
same. This raised Charles' temper to a high
pitch. But Mr. A., Charles' father, who had
been watching the movements among these
boys for some time, and studying how he
might effect a reconciliation among them,
thought that a favorable opportunity was now
presented for him to make the attempt. Ac-
cordingly, he went to work on the following
evening, and made Charles a very nice kite;
and, calling him up early in the morning, told
him to carry it over and make a present of it
to John; instructing him at the same time to
speak kindly to John and to return just so
soon as he had done his errand, and that,
even if he might be imposed upon by him,
not to reply or do anything by way of retali-
ation. This was a hard task indeed for Charles'
nature. He hardly knew how to come to the
practice of such principles. But finally he
concluded to comply with his father's wish-
es, and so away he went. He arrived at the
house where John lived before he was up.
But it being announced to him that Charles
had called to see him, he was soon out of bed
to meet him, and perhaps to fulfil the threat
of the day before. But Charles said "Good

morning," to him very pleasantly, presented
him with the new kite, and then turned di-
rectly back. This was a mysterious case for
John. He did not know what to make of it.
Nor did it in the least sharpen up his deter-
mination to whip Charles. In a few days,
Mr. A. thought he would just call on Mrs.
B., John's mother, and see what kind of a
spirit the kite was working out. So, after
conversing a while on other things, he just
alluded to the case of the kite. This was
enough to stir up the ire of the mother fur-
iously enough. She began on an elevated
key to commend her son. "He is a good,
peaceful boy, and will not meddle with chera,
if they do not injure him." "I do not doubt,"
answered Mr. A., "that my boy did very
wrong and imposed upon John. I know that
he is sometimes very regular, and does dif-
ferently from what he should. But," an-
swered Mrs. B., a little cooled down, "for
what reason did Charles give John that kite?
I do not understand it. Did he not intend to
impose upon John?" "No imposition," re-
plied Mr. A., "Charles thought that John
would like to have a kite, and therefore he
thought he would make a present of that to
him." This conversation had the effect to
cool down Mrs. B.'s ire altogether, and to
change her about in favor of Charles. "Well,"
said she, "I know that John is an ugly, mis-
chief-making fellow, and is often getting into
quarrels with the other boys. He has now
been and broken up Charles' kite, a good for
nothing wretch. He ought to be whipped as
long as he can see." "Oh no," rejoined Mr.
A., "that would not be right. John is quite
a good sort of a boy; and he would not have
done so, if the others had not imposed upon
him." "Well," replied Mrs. B., "John
shall carry the kite back to Charles, and make
an humble acknowledgment to him."—
"Charles does not wish for that," answered
the father. "He can have kites enough. You
had better let John keep it." But John, be-
ing in hearing, had become about as much
mellowed down as the mother, so that he could
not refrain from crying. Thus Mr. A. left
and went home. But presently, looking out
of the window, he saw John loitering about
the house, not hardly daring to come in. He
stepped to the door, and inquired—"What
do you wish for, John?"—"I wish to see
Charles," answered John, in a very subdued
tone of voice. So Charles was called, to
whom John remarked, "I have brought your
kite, and wish you to take it back." "Oh
no," said Charles, "I do not wish to take it
back. I give it to you. Keep it yourself.
You wish to have one, and I can get kites
enough." But no, John cried, and insisted
that Charles should take it back, which he
finally did. From this occasion, quarrels be-
tween these boys wholly ceased. They are
now as harmonious as any boys. The kite
made peace among them. Such are the legiti-
mate results of peace principles.—Morning
Star.

THE USE OF TOBACCO.

Is a dangerous inducement to Intemperance.

"Tobacco belongs to the class of narcotic
stimulants. As a medicine, it is occasionally
employed by the profession. As a provoca-
tive to drinking it has been condemned by
the wisest of men. Sylvester, in allusion to
this well known property of tobacco, playfully
but ingeniously, derives its name from
Bacchus.

"Which of their weapons hath conquest
gotten,
Over their wits; the pipe or else the pot?
For even the devotion of the name
Seems to allude to, and include the same:
Tobacco, as to Bacchus—one would say;
To cup god B. echus dedicated eye."

"Raphael Thorius appears to have been of
a similar opinion, for he attributes the discov-
ery of this noxious herb to Bacchus Silenus,
and the *satyrs*, the representatives of drunk-
ennes, gluttony and lust. Dr. Adam Clarke,
in his admirable treatise on tobacco, remark-
ed that "so inseparable an attendant is drink-
ing on smoking, that in some places the same
word expresses both; thus *peened*, in the Ben-
galee language, signifies to drink and to
smoke." "It is with pain of heart," adds
the same distinguished writer, "that I am ob-
liged to say, I have known several, who,
through their immoderate attachment to the
pipe, have become wretches. There are oth-
ers who are walking unbecomingly in the
same dangerous road. I trouble for them."

The late governor Sullivan of America, in
speaking of the use of tobacco, remarks: "that
the tobacco-pipe excites a demand for an ex-
traordinary quantity of some beverage to sup-
ply the waste of glandular secretion in pro-
portion to the expense of saliva; and ardent
spirits are the common substitutes; and the
smoker is often reduced to a state of dram-
drinking, and finishes his life as a sot." Dr.
Rush observes "that smoking and chewing
tobacco, by rendering water and other sim-
ple liquors insipid to the taste, disposes very
much to the stronger stimulants of ardent spir-
its, hence, (remarks that writer,) the practice
of smoking cigars has been followed by the
use of brandy and water as a common drink." Dr.
Agnew also asserts, "that the use of the
pipe leads to the use of ardent spirits." A
writer in "The Genius of Temperance," an
American publication, states that the practice
of smoking and chewing tobacco, "produced
a continual thirst for stimulating drinks; and
this tormenting thirst (says he,) led me into
the habit of drinking ale, porter, brandy, and
other kinds of spirit, even to the extent, at
times, partial intoxication." The writer adds:
"I reformed; and after I had subdued this ap-
petite for tobacco, I lost my desire for strong
drinks."

"The amount of intemperance arising from
this cause, if followed to its actual issues,
would be truly startling. One writer on the
subject is of opinion, that it would amount to
not less than one-tenth of the drunkards an-
nually made through this nation. The prac-
tice, however, is beyond all doubt a fruitful
source of intemperance, and as such, ought to
be disused by every one who regards the
welfare and happiness of either himself or
his fellow creatures."—English Paper.

* Dissertation on the use and abuse of to-
bacco, by Dr. Adam Clarke, p. 43, ed. 1837.